1	ANDREW P. THOMAS	
	MARICOPA COUNTY ATTORNEY	
2	(FIRM STATE BAR NO. 0003200)	
3		
3	PHILIP J. MACDONNELL	
4	CHIEF DEPUTY	
	301 West Jefferson Street	
5	Phoenix, Arizona 85003	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
6	TELEPHONE: (602) 506-3800	
0	(STATE BAR NUMBER 003813)	
7		
8	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA	
9		
10		
11	In the Matter of	Supreme Court No. R-05-0036
12		
	PETITION TO AMEND RULE 18,	MARICOPA COUNTY ATTORNEY'S
13	ARIZONA RULES OF CIVIL APPELLATE	COMMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE
14	PROCEDURE (ORAL ARGUMENTS)	PETITION TO AMEND RULE 18,
17		ARIZONA RULES OF CIVIL
15		APPELLATE PROCEDURE
16	The Maricopa County Attorney hereby comments in support of the Petition to amend Rule 18,	
17		
	Ariz. Rules of Civil Appellate Procedure.	
18	72 11 12 11 12 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	
10	Respectfully submitted this 2 day of May, 2006.	
19	ANDREW P. THOMAS	
20	MARICOPA COUNTY ATTORNEY	
0.1		
21	$D \setminus D \setminus D \setminus C$	
22	BY: Bulys & In Danie	
	PHILIP J. MACDONNELL	
23	CHIEF DEPUTY	
24		
25		
26		
20		
27		

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

The Maricopa County Attorney believes that the proposed amendment to Rule 18, Arizona Rules of Civil Appellate Procedure, is appropriate and worthy of adoption. As pointed out in the Petition for Amendment, Rule 18 in its current form creates a potential trap for a conscientious appellee. While the laudable goal of maximizing judicial economy is best promoted by requesting oral argument only when necessary, the present Rule 18 requires a cautious practitioner to make an oral argument request in most every case "just in case". Petitioner notes that while a Reply Brief is limited to responding to the issues raised in the Answering Brief, reality teaches that this is not always so. Moreover, even when the Reply Brief is appropriately limited, it may still present its arguments in a fashion which is best addressed by oral argument.

The proposed amendment will provide balance to the appellate process while allowing appellees to seek oral argument only when necessary. Appellants will not be adversely affected. The proposed amendment should be adopted.

Respectfully submitted this 22 day of May, 2006.

ANDREW P. THOMAS
MARICOPA COUNTY ATTORNEY

 $\mathbf{R}\mathbf{v}$

PHILIP J. MACDONNELL

CHIEF DEPUTY

Copies of the forgoing hand delivered this <u>W</u>day of May, 2006 to:

Clerk of the Court Arizona Supreme Court